

REMARKS

Claims 8-15 are pending in the present application. Claim 8 was amended in this response. No new matter was introduced as a result of the amendment. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph since it was alleged that the phrase “AT command” was not defined by the claim or expounded further in the specification. Applicant submits that “AT command” is a term known in the art, which relates to an “attention command” in relation to modem command sets (e.g., 3GPP - see paragraph [001] of present specification). In the spirit of cooperation, Applicant has amended claim 8 to incorporate this language. In light of the present amendment, Applicants submit the matter has been addressed. Withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly requested.

Claims 8, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Liou et al.* (US Pub. 2003/0207703). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Liou et al.* (US Pub. 2003/0207703) in view of *Hanson et al.* (US Pub. 2002/0098840). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Liou et al.* (US Pub. 2003/0207703) in view of *Bajikar* (US Pub. 2003/0003943). Claim 13 (erroneously identified as Claim 11 in paragraph 9 of the Office Action) was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Liou et al.* (US Pub. 2003/0207703). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Liou et al.* (US Pub. 2003/0207703) in view of *Benedyk et al.* (US Pub. 2005/0033684). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Favorable reconsideration is earnestly requested.

Specifically, the cited art, alone or in combination, does not teach the feature “wherein an electrical assignment of the plurality of connection pins is reconfigurable such that the internal microprocessor device uses at least one of the plurality of connection pins both for the passive mode of operation and for one of the active modes of operations” as recited in claim 8. The present claims address a radio module that is operable under an active and passive mode (described in claim 8), where the number of pins are reduced by utilizing one or more reconfigurable pins, where each pin operates in both a passive mode of operation and an active modes of operation.

In contrast, *Liou* teaches a headset 16, provided with a connector 5 for connecting the headset to a the U.S.B. port 70, through a cable, of another apparatus, such as a personal computer 7, to function as wireless data link. The connector is disclosed as a port in the headset housing, or alternatively as a plug to connect the device directly to the U.S.B. port of the computer ([0026]). Thus, it is clear that *Liou* connector is not reconfigurable - the disclosure expressly teaches the connector as a straightforward USB cable that utilizes only a passive mode (see [0029]). Furthermore, *Liou* is completely silent regarding the specific pin configuration, and certainly does not disclose a specific pin being reconfigurable in a passive and active mode of operation. Furthermore, *Liou* fails to teach or suggest the use of AT commands for actuating the radio module. The other cited references fail to solve the deficiencies of Liou, discussed above.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-15 are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0112740-1037) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Peter Zura
Reg. No. 48,196
Customer No.: 29177
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: April 17, 2006